1st November 1932]

satisfied and went so far as to attack him in his car. As further trouble was expected, a party of reserve police was temporarily quartered at the Zamindar's residence to prevent any disturbance of the peace.

3. Everything went on smoothly for sometime and collections proceeded peacefully till March 1932, when the situation again changed for the worse. Certain persons again began to hold secret meetings and advise tenants to agitate against the collection of rents. The ryots began to assault the zamin officials and a serious breach of the peace between the two parties was apprehended. An order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, was therefore promulgated in eight villages. In June 1932 the District Superintendent of Police went to Udayarpalaiyam with a party of reserve police. He visited the villages, interviewed the leaders and tenants and warned them against illegal action and advised them to adopt constitutional methods. As a result the situation returned to normal and rents were paid.

4. The reserve party remained in Udayarpalaiyam from the 7th to the 16th June 1932 when everything appeared quiet enough to warrant their departure. They visited the affected villages in the zamindari accompanied by the District Superintendent of Police, but not by the Zamindar's band and officials.

5. The police interference was in the interest of law and order. No contribution was asked for from the Zamindar or paid by him.

Arrest and detention of Messrs. Saravam Pillai and Pichai Pillai of Udaiyarpalaiyam.

* 259-C *Q.*—Mr. V. T. Arasu: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that in the month of August 1931 Messrs. Saravam Pillai and Pichai Pillai of Angarayanallore, Udaiyarpalaiyam taluk, Trichinopoly district, were arrested and kept in remand;

(*b*) if so, under what section and for what offence were they arrested and under whose orders;

(*c*) whether any warrant was obtained by the police before they were arrested; if not, why not;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that they were arrested and kept in remand on the 14th of August whereas the first information report against them was recorded and forwarded only on the 16th of that month;

(*e*) if so, what were the reasons for this irregularity in procedure and what action the Government propose to take against those responsible; and

[1st November 1932

(*f*) whether it is a fact that the order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, which they were alleged to have disobeyed was served on them only when they were in the lock-up?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) They were arrested by the police under section 151, Criminal Procedure Code, as there was danger of the commission of offences involving a breach of the peace.

(*c*) No warrant of arrest was obtained by the police as no warrant is required for arrests under section 151, Criminal Procedure Code.

(*d*) They were arrested by the police on 14th August 1931 and remanded by the Subdivisional Magistrate, Ariyalur, on 15th August 1931 pending receipt of the charge-sheet. The first information report and the charge-sheet, dated 16th August 1931 were received by the Subdivisional Magistrate on the same day.

(*e*) It is reported that the police had reasonable cause to think that there was danger of the commission of offences involving a breach of the peace which could be prevented only by the immediate arrest of the persons concerned. There was no irregularity of procedure in arresting these persons under section 151, Criminal Procedure Code, and producing them before a Magistrate without avoidable delay for remand.

(*f*) The arrest on the 14th August 1931 was, as stated above, not made for any disobedience of orders under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code.

Arrest of Mr. Pennadam Somasundaram Pillai and seven others of Udaiyarpalaiyam and the attachment of their properties.

* 259-D *Q.*—Mr. V. T. Arasu: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Pennadam Somasundaram Pillai and seven other respectable and peaceful ryots of Udaiyarpalaiyam zamindari were ordered to be arrested, their properties attached and proclamation of sale issued on the 17th of August 1931;

(*b*) if so, whether any reasons were given by the officer who ordered those proceedings, and if so, what they are;

(*c*) under what provisions of law were the properties ordered to be attached;

(*d*) what the circumstances were that led to this series of proceedings all on one and the same day; and

(*e*) whether any opportunity was given to the said accused to explain their conduct before orders were passed, and if not, why not?